

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 4 and 9-12 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5-8 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Gross (U.S. Patent No.: 4,326,260). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gross. Finally, claims 1, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Duvanenko et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,951,625), hereinafter referred to as Duvanenko.

§ 112, second paragraph, Rejections - Claims 5-8 and 14-18

Claims 5-8 and 14-18 are rejected for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the present Office Action.

Specifically, with respect to claim 5, the Examiner states “it is unclear as to what it means by the recitation ‘depending on exponents of 2 corresponding to the differences between real seed addresses which correspond to the seed values stored in the storing means’. Claims 8 and 17 also have similar problems.”

Also, the Examiner alleges, with respect to claim 14, that “the recitation in step (e) ‘performing a predetermined operation using the upper and lower addresses’ is misdescriptive.”

Applicant amends claims 5-8, 14, and 17¹, as indicated herein, and Applicant believes that these amendments obviate the Examiner's rejections of claims 5-8 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

§ 102(b) Rejections (Gross) - Claims 1, 2, and 13

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, and 13 over Gross for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner alleges the following:

Gross discloses in figure 1 an apparatus for detecting an operation value for input data including a means (34) for storing unevenly spaced seed values (34, see figure 4), and address and data generator (24,26) for comparing the input data with reference values (see figure 3) and generating an address (28) and revised input data (36), and an operator (22,40) for performing a predetermined operation to output an operation values as claimed.

To anticipate a claimed invention, a single reference must teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Here, with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Gross does not teach or suggest at least “a means for storing seed values corresponding to seed points determined according to a range of the input data and output data and an error rate,” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. That is, upon review of Gross, nowhere does this reference disclose that seed points are determined according to a range of the input data and output data and an error rate. Nowhere does Gross even mention the use of error rate therein.

Applicant submits that claims 2 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

¹ Applicant submits that the amendment to claim 5 is supported by page 7, lines 2-4 of the present specification; the amendment to claim 8 is supported by page 7, lines 17-19 of the present specification.

Further, with respect to claim 13, Applicant submits that nowhere does Gross even mention a look-up table, as described in claim 13.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, and 13 are patentably distinguishable over Gross.

§ 103(a) Rejection (Gross) - Claim 3

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action.

First, Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1. Further, Applicant notes that the Examiner acknowledges that Gross does not disclose the addition of new seed points until an error value satisfies error rate conditions. However, the Examiner essentially alleges that the limitations of claim 3 are suggested, “in order to reduce errors”. Applicant submits that the Examiner has obviously employed impermissible hindsight reasoning in concluding that the features of claim 3 are suggested by Gross, as nowhere does Gross even mention or imply the use of error values in its invention. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that dependent claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over Gross.

§ 102(b) Rejections (Duvanenko) - Claims 1, 13, 14, 17, and 18

Claims 1, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for the reasons set forth on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner alleges:

Duvanenko et al. discloses in figure 3A an apparatus for detecting an operation value for input data including a means (34) for storing seed values (22), and address and data generator (24) for comparing the input data with a reference value (see figure 4, 100) and generating an upper address and a lower address (see figure 4,

114, 118), and revised input data (20), and an operator (26) for performing a predetermined operation to output an operation values as claimed.

In response, similar to the argument above with respect to the rejection of claim 1 with respect to Gross, Applicant submits that Duvanenko does not teach or suggest at least “a means for storing seed values corresponding to seed points determined according to a range of the input data and output data and an error rate,” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. That is, nowhere does Duvanenko disclose that seed points are determined accounting to a range of the input data and output data and an error rate. Nowhere does Duvanenko even mention the use of error rate therein.

Applicant submits that dependent claim 13 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

With respect to independent claim 14, Applicant submits that the Examiner does not demonstrate, and Duvanenko does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of this claim. That is, nowhere does the Examiner mention nor does Duvanenko teach or suggest each and every step recited in claim 14. For example, similar to the argument set forth above with respect to claim 1, Duvanenko fails to teach or suggest at least “(a) storing seed values corresponding to seed points determined according to ranges of the input data and output data and an error rate,” as recited in claim 14.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 17 and 18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 14.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 09/755,189

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q62412

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 4, 2004